

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Amendments to the Drawings

Applicants hereby submit six replacement sheets for Figures 1-5. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge the drawings as acceptable in the next action.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1-29 are cancelled by way of this reply without prejudice or disclaimer. Further, claims 30-58 are newly added by way of this reply. Of the newly added claims, claims 30, 40, and 49 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 30, 40, and 49.

Claim Amendments

Claims 30-58 are newly added by way of this reply. No new subject matter is added by the new claims as support for these claims may be found, for example, in p. 14, ll. 19 – p. 17, ll. 12 of the Specification and in Figure 5.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,189,030 (“Kirsch”). As discussed above, claims 1-29 are cancelled by way of this

reply. Accordingly, the rejection is now moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Claims 30-48

As discussed above, claims 30-48 are added by way of this reply. New independent claim 30 recites, in part, “determining, using the tracking logic, that the redirection loop exists by detecting that a predefined maximum number of redirections occur within a predefined time limit from the first web destination to the second web destination; and terminating the redirection loop.” New independent claim 40 include similar limitations. Applicants respectfully assert Kirsch fails to disclose at least these recited limitations of the new independent claims.

Kirsch merely discloses a mechanism for using embedded redirections to track when a user uses an online advertisement to access a web page. Kirsch is completely silent with respect to redirection loops. Because Kirsch does not disclose redirection loops, Kirsch cannot teach “determining, using the tracking logic, that the redirection loop exists by detecting that a predefined maximum number of redirections occur within a predefined time limit from the first web destination to the second web destination; and terminating the redirection loop,” as required by the new independent claims.

Thus, new independent claims 30 and 40 are patentable over Kirsch. Dependent claims 31-39 and 41-48 are allowable over Kirsch for at least the same reasons. A favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 49-58

As discussed above, claims 49-58 are added by way of this reply. New independent claim 49 recites, in part, “incrementing a counter when the subsequent redirection from the first web destination to the second web destination occurs within the predefined time limit.” Applicants respectfully assert Kirsch fails to disclose at least these recited limitations of the new independent claim 49.

As stated above, Kirsch merely discloses a mechanism for using embedded redirections to track when a user uses an online advertisement to access a web page. Kirsch is completely silent with respect to the timing between redirections. Thus, Kirsch cannot teach “incrementing a counter when the subsequent redirection from the first web destination to the second web destination occurs within the predefined time limit,” as required by new independent claim 49.

Thus, new independent claim 49 is patentable over Kirsch. Dependent claims 50-58 are allowable over Kirsch for at least the same reasons. A favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/441001).

Dated: July 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
R. Ellen Baker
Registration No.: 50,272
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments (6 Replacement Sheets)